

# CU VOICE

No. 6

June 1968

Published in the interest of the staff of the University of California Library by the University Federation of Librarians, Berkeley Campus, AFT Local 1795 (AFL - CIO)

Rudolf Lednicky, President  
Allan Covici, Editor, CU Voice  
Jean Hudson, Associate Editor

## THE THAW?

### Vosper Warns UCLA on Staff Treatment

Treatment of library staff at the University of California at Los Angeles, in contrast to treatment of faculty, is "disgracefully old-fashioned" and dangerously so, according to Robert Vosper, librarian of the university, in his annual report to the Chancellor.

Salaries, fringe benefits, and status within the academic community were pointed out by Vosper as the main problem areas. He warned that librarians would turn to "adversary tactics" (collective bargaining) as other professional groups have done so successfully. This, he remarked, "would be most unfortunate because it would deny the essential unity of the entire academic community."

Vosper put the blame on the "statewide administration and Academic Senate for being 'slow to recognize that on these matters they are quite out of touch with enlightened developments across the country.'"

Library Journal, June 1, 1968, page 2196.

In response to the insistent demands at the University of California for concrete improvements in the status, classification, salaries and fringe benefits of librarians, the Personnel Subcommittee of the Library Council has issued two Working Papers. (The Library Council includes the head librarian on each campus, the deans of the University's two schools of librarianship, the director and assistant director of the University's Institute of Library Research, the University Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chairman of the statewide Academic Senate Library Committee.)

**WORKING PAPER NO. 1: Librarian Classification and Pay Plan**, was released in August 1967. It assumed that "there should be a high degree of equivalency between salary administration for faculty and librarians." It suggested that ranks of Assistant Librarian, Associate Li-

brarian, and Librarian might be substituted for the present Librarian I-V ranks. Criteria for employment of librarians under the new system were discussed, as well as methods of evaluating performance and the problem of those librarians who might not qualify for a suggested "tenure" arrangement.

On several campuses, special committees were formed to investigate and make recommendations. At Berkeley, the University Federation of Librarians prepared two papers and forwarded them to the Council, which discussed them at a subsequent meeting and suggested adoption of some of the procedural points they contained.

**WORKING PAPER NO. 2: Proposal for Restructuring the Classification and Salary Plan for University of California Library Staff**, was released in April 1968. This lengthy paper was the outcome of the Council's directive to its Subcommittee to develop a concrete proposal for future implementation. The Subcommittee did so, this time providing a detailed four-step plan for librarians, as well as separate plans for nonprofessional library employees. Said the Subcommittee in its report:

A satisfactory classification and pay plan for professional library staff should encourage individual development, provide compensation appropriate to requirements and functions, establish a collegial relationship, and assure security of employment to protect individual initiative. The organizational pattern of the library should provide opportunities for each librarian to develop to the limits of his ability. Thus a classification and pay plan should be based on professional growth as evidenced by demonstrable accomplishments. The most appropriate pattern for the academic librarian is that which has been adopted for all other academic categories which provide for parallel development through a series of stages which is not tied to administrative responsibility ....

In developing its proposal the Personnel Subcommittee made the following assumptions:

1. The professional librarian will cease being a "professional" technician to become a truly professional academic staff member with the opportunity to develop his full potential as creatively as possible.

2. The clerical and technical work previously performed by the professional librarian would be reassigned to career non-professional library staff. The ratio between professional and non-professional library employees would be drastically altered.

3. The needs of the academic community will dictate the extent to which such a change is possible.

4. The organization of libraries and the distribution of labor would be modified to provide more work of a higher intellectual level for the professional librarian.

This proposal may seem revolutionary to many. Because it is revolutionary, the Subcommittee suggests that the transition from the present to the future will be evolutionary. Many present librarians will be expected to change in order to qualify for the proposed library system. Library schools will need to develop new programs in order to train the type of professional who will inhabit the proposed system. Work will need to be redistributed so that it can be assigned on the basis of content, i.e. professional vs. non-professional. Organization, not only within libraries but within the structure of the campus and University, will require modification to accommodate a more collegial pattern in a hierarchical structure.

The Subcommittee believes that when the new system becomes operative, with appropriate organizational change including staffing pattern, the quality of the total library operation will be significantly improved without significant increase in staff cost.

It is conservatively estimated that if the new classification plan were adopted and approved for use by 1 July 1969 several years would be required for a complete transition from the present to the new structure. Accordingly, the Personnel Subcommittee suggests that the present system cannot be abandoned suddenly. Both systems will be required for an undeterminable length of time until individual librarians qualify themselves for the new system and until the organization can be modified to accommodate this change as individuals are moved into an appropriate rank in the new system.

The Personnel Subcommittee, therefore, solicits the courage of management and staff to give careful consideration to the proposal offered and invites comment which will facilitate further development of The Classification and Salary Plan for University of California Library Staff.

Copies of Working Paper No. 1 were distributed to all professional librarians. In sharp contrast, two copies of Working Paper No. 2, a far more important document, were sent to each Library Department head; members of the Librarians' Advisory Board each received a copy; and

"a limited number" were sent to the Library Personnel Office. A notice to this effect appeared in the CU News issue of April 4, together with an invitation to submit written comments by April 15. In a letter to William E. Wenz, Library Personnel Officer on the Berkeley campus, The University Federation of Librarians protested the limited distribution of the Paper and the brief period of time allotted for submission of comments. It pointed out that copies of the Paper should have been distributed to all staff members, and asked that this procedure be adopted in the future for documents of such obvious importance.

In its necessarily limited comments, the UFL approved the general tenor of the Paper, but found serious shortcomings in it. Said the UFL:

Criteria for advancement by librarians under the new system are modelled upon faculty criteria, without provision for the numerous supporting conditions available to the faculty, such as offices for research, clerical support, sabbatical leaves, access to research grants, and financial assistance in attending professional meetings. At least a measure of such support mechanisms must be made available to librarians .... Even the modest request for the waiver of fees for librarians continuing their formal education at the University has yet to be achieved.

There are no means put forward to implement the proposed restructuring. It is not enough to describe the proposals as "revolutionary," implying that they are so drastic that it will take years to carry them out. In view of what ... is happening elsewhere in the country, these proposals are not that radical.

We are guided by our professional determination of what needs to be accomplished, rather than by passive acceptance of "the extent to which such change is possible" as envisioned by "the needs of the academic community."

The Library Council estimates that several years will be required for a complete transition from the old system to a satisfactory new one. The UFL agrees that a major restructuring cannot be accomplished overnight. It does wish to point out, however, that delaying tactics are a favorite ploy of the University. It says in the strongest terms that the patience of the librarians on the Berkeley campus is not inexhaustible; that they will not quietly submit to the familiar stratagem of administrative stalling; that they expect action, and expect it soon.

If the courage of management is not adequate to the challenge of a changing pattern of librarianship in this country, then management must expect to face the increasingly united opposition of a profession which will not tolerate much longer the contemptuous treatment it has been accorded on this campus. Management has an opportunity now to unite with its staff instead of providing the kind of intransigent "leadership" that leads to academic crisis. We hope it will take advantage of this opportunity while it still exists.

## The Right to Strike

All professional workers soon will be represented by unions or at least by "organizations that act like unions." This was the prediction of Joseph Garbarino, Professor of Business Administration at the University of California, voiced at a conference on Emerging Public Employee Labor Relations in California. Sponsored by the Center for Labor Research and Education, University of California, the conference was held in San Francisco on June 7 - 8, 1968. Professor Garbarino went on to say that such people as professors, engineers, medical and social workers — he could as well have included librarians — are becoming increasingly concerned about on-the-job matters that are ignored by the professional organizations that traditionally represent them, and will eventually turn to unions to do the job.

Victor Van Bourg, a local union attorney, stated that there is no legislation in California denying public employees (except fire fighters) the right to strike. Public employees, he continued, are in the same position as private employees. If they strike, they may be replaced by their employer, but not if they all act together. No employer, said Van Bourg, "can afford to denude himself of all his help."

The panelists in both the Friday morning and afternoon discussions felt that it had become meaningless to talk about "the right to strike." The fact is that public employees are striking, and engaging in collective bargaining successfully with state and municipal agencies all over California. In San Francisco recently, nurses went on strike for one day and won a 42 percent pay raise. San Francisco teachers, who struck in March 1968, are presently negotiating the 92 demands in their "Teachers' Union Action Program", which consists largely of improvements that will benefit their students, such as reduced class size and better libraries.

All participants in the conference — the organizers, the four guest speakers, the twelve panelists (union representatives) and the audience — agreed that public employees do indeed have the right to strike and to engage in collective bargaining. The one essential element in any union action remains what it has always been: the strength that employees can bring to bear to achieve the goals they seek.

## The Right to Fire

The University's attorney, Milton Gordon, told the Superior Court that "the University has the right to hire and fire at will. The University is not the Civil Service and has no contractual agreement with its employees." When the Judge asked Gordon whether or not he wanted to apply the rules fairly, Gordon answered in the affirmative, but stated that the University was not required to be fair. "The University has rules so that it can treat employees fairly but is under no obligation to do so."

UC Clerical, Technical, & Professional Employees Press, December 28, 1967, page 4.

## The Transfer of Authority

... the problem of authority change in libraries may be less important in the long run than the less visible issue of authority change within the modern library staff — and specifically the need to delegate authority or freedom to the increasingly mature professionals whom library schools are attempting to produce and library directors to hire. These "new breed" librarians of whom we expect so much don't plan to punch time cards for a boss, but to work with a director who is "first among equals."

Drives for faculty status for academic librarians have been going on with varying success for years now, and in situations where open conflict arises, labor unions are being brought in to deal with the administrator as an adversary rather than as a colleague. But there are as yet few signs of creative response by administrators.

... authority, once won, is hard to relinquish, and as Lear found out, it's a tricky business, for one's own freedom to act (or not to act) may well depend on others being unfree. Maybe administrators need continuing education more than anyone in libraries.

... libraries, for the first time, have access to research funds and funds to support experiment. With this largesse available, the way is clear to question even the oldest and most respectable assumptions — among them the way in which libraries are organized and the emphasis on the library as an institution rather than on librarianship as a function which may be situated in many environments.

The administrator who experiments boldly in the decentralization of policy-making and the design of library service, to the end of fully liberating the librarians on his staff — and possibly enfranchising the library's public — will tread on uncertain ground and sleep uneasily on many a night. But in the meantime, he won't have any recruitment problems.

"The Transfer of Authority" by Karl Nyren, Editorial in Library Journal, June 1, 1968, page 2189.

### Confronted? Cornered? Confused? Stall!

At a seminar during the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, one superintendent advised his colleagues how to handle the new militancy of teachers: stall. "Acknowledge receipt of the teachers' proposals and then wait." The correct technique, he continued, was to divert the attention of the teachers from their demands by offering cagily-worded counterproposals. "It worked in my district. The teachers forgot all about their 15 percent salary hike demand," he bragged.

American Teacher, v. 52, no. 7, March 1968.



## THE UNIVERSITY AS ADVERSARY

Librarians at Berkeley have long felt the need for an equitable grievance procedure. Although the University in 1962 classified them as academic personnel, it has continued, in the absence of anything else, to apply its non-academic grievance procedure to them. The procedure was not satisfactory under librarians' former classification. It is even less satisfactory now. One bitter case, now more than three years old, provides an instructive guide to the kind of injustice that can occur under a procedure that is not required to observe the principles of due process of law. (CU Voice No. 4, November 1966) The decision in the case of Chizuko Ishimatsu vs. the Regents of the University of California will be argued in the Court of Appeal, State Building, San Francisco, on July 19, 1968, at 10 a.m.

Concerned over this situation, the University Federation of Librarians (then the Library Chapter of AFT Local 1474) drafted a Proposed Grievance Procedure for Non-Teaching and Non-Senate Academic Employees of the University of California. In July 1966, copies were sent to appropriate campus officers, including Earl F. Cheit, Executive Vice Chancellor; John T. Wheeler, Chairman of the Library Committee of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate; and John Wagner, Campus Personnel Manager.

The Federation felt it had reason to hope for substantive improvements, since two University-wide committees — one of the Academic Senate and the other advisory to President Kerr — had meantime been formed "... to study the whole problem of appointments of academic personnel who are not officers of instruction or members of the Academic Senate; and to explore possibilities of (a) establishing grievance and appeals procedures for the benefit of these individuals, and (b) establishing a set of standards defining the University's minimum commitment to them." (Resolution of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, May 23, 1966) Copies of the Federation's revised grievance procedure were sent to the members of these committees.

In November 1967 the Chancellor's Office released copies of an Interim Appeals Procedure for Non-Senate Academic Appointees. It had been drawn up, approved, distributed and put into effect without any attempt at consultation with the librarians who were affected and who apparently had not been able to make clear that their vital interest in such a document demanded that they have a voice in its preparation. In January 1968, the Federation wrote to Vice Chancellor Cheit protesting the failure of the Procedure to incorporate such a crucial element as participation of librarians in the selection of a three-member hearing committee. Mr. Cheit, it continued, would shortly receive a letter presenting the Federation's point of view in some detail.

On February 1, Mr. Cheit replied, in part: "I certainly look forward to your proposals with respect to appointments to the appeals procedure. We have reviewed several alternatives and would welcome the chance to talk to you about your suggestions."

Dear Mr. Cheit:

Thank you for your letter of February 1 and your invitation to talk with us about the Interim Appeals Procedure for non-Senate academic employees. We would indeed like to discuss it, both with you and with representatives of the Personnel Office.

In 1967 we submitted our own grievance procedure to the Chancellor's Office, the Personnel Office, and other appropriate offices and committees of the University. Meetings were held with Mr. Wagner and Mr. Small of the Personnel Office, and after taking into account their criticisms and suggestions, we submitted a revised procedure based on the experiences and judgments of our members. The Personnel Office discontinued discussions because of the pressure of other affairs during a period of campus crisis.

Although we had given every indication of serious and continued interest in an equitable grievance procedure, an Interim Appeals Procedure was written and put into effect without prior consultation. In this case, normal administrative channels have proved completely futile.

The Interim Appeals Procedure is unsatisfactory to us in a number of ways. We should be glad to discuss our criticisms of it with you if indeed the University Administration has any serious desire to translate the wishes of its academic employees into mutually acceptable programs and procedures.

Rudolf Lednicky  
President, University  
Federation of Librarians

Mr. Cheit did not reply to this letter. On March 12 Mr. Wagner telephoned Mr. Lednicky to say that Mr. Cheit was too busy to handle the matter personally and had asked the Personnel Office to assume this responsibility. Mr. Lednicky's reply to this telephone conversation was as follows:

April 1, 1968

Dear Mr. Wagner:

When you telephoned on March 12 regarding our letter to Mr. Cheit, you stated that arbitration of grievances was out of the question and that discussion was futile unless we had something new to offer. Are you suggesting that all of the points in our grievance procedure are invalid and not open to fruitful discussion? We had, as you know, twice revised our recommendations in terms of your comments and criticisms.

Inadequacies in the Interim Appeals Procedure include the following:

1. The employees concerned have no part in the settlement of grievances. They have no part in either the making or the interpretation of the rules. The Chancellor appoints the hearing committee which may or may not include peers of the aggrieved employees.

2. Provisions for the hearings are inadequate and inefficient.

March 6, 1968

## THERE'S A LOT OF ORGANIZING GOING ON

Don Koué

"LOCAL 1570 LEADERSHIP has made its point with the Central Labor Council, and I'm sure that if we had to close down the University, all the unions, including the building trades, would have gone along, and we would have had a tight strike," announced Dick Groulx, secretary-treasurer of the Alameda County Central Labor Council, at a sunny noontime rally on Sproul Hall steps early this month. His statement seemed to end, for the moment, the threat of a strike that would probably have been the most serious in Berkeley campus history. At a press conference earlier that morning, Bob Atkins, president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Local 1570 (AFL-CIO), known on campus as the teaching assistants' union, had made public the terms of a verbal agreement Local 1570 had reached with the campus administration on a grievance procedure for TAs. The dispute turned on the question of when TAs, who are graduate students, should be disciplined by the University as students and when as employees. Atkins announced that henceforth the employment status of TAs would be considered apart from their student status. More important, the union had won the right to appoint one, and have veto power over another, of the three-man grievance committee that would hear charges affecting their employment status. Although the chancellor would remain the final decision maker in all cases, this appeared to be a substantial change in the University's position concerning grievance procedures. However, nothing was on paper yet, and a final vote on whether to drop the strike threat was not to be taken by Local 1570 until April 18.

Even the possibility of a Labor Council-backed strike by one of the new white-collar campus unions, however, indicates that the University faces a new era of labor problems instigated by a portion of its staff few would have anticipated trouble from even ten years ago. (The Berkeley campus has had two major labor—as opposed to student—strikes. The first, in 1950, was the result of a dispute over pay rates with the custodians. It lasted two weeks. Teach-

ing went on almost as usual but the situation on campus got, quite literally, pretty messy. The second, in 1954, lasted only two days, and was a dispute over wages and fringe benefits with the building trades unions. While there have been no other general labor strikes, Lamar Childers, secretary-treasurer of the Alameda County Building Trades Council, indicated other methods of putting pressure on the University are used, "Since the University doesn't like pickets, we don't call a strike; we just all go fishing for a day.") In addition to Local 1570, there are three other new AFL-CIO locals on campus—the professors' AFT Local 1474, which claims few actual dues-paying members but a sympathetic membership of perhaps 20 per cent of the faculty, the librarians' AFT Local 1795, which has some 50 members, or about one-third of the professional librarians on campus, and the clerical, technical, and professional workers' American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 1695, which has about 300 members out of a potential membership pool they estimate at between two and three thousand. Along with the teaching assistants, who claim 300 unionized TAs among the 1,200 employed by the campus and 200 other campus-employed students, the librarians and the clerical workers have begun to kick up a fuss over campus working conditions and grievance procedures. The issues are not ones that will be easily settled.

THERE IS AN emotional as well as an historical link between the new unions and the 1964 Free Speech Movement (FSM), which remains the main reference point for much of what has happened since on the Berkeley campus and, indeed, in the academic world as a whole. The TAs' union was born during the FSM; the librarians formed as a distinct group the following spring; and the clerical workers banded together with the considerable assistance of—and one is tempted to say as the women's auxiliary of—the TAs' union. (Although Local 1695 includes clerical, technical, and professional workers in its title, it appears to be dominated—if by default—by clerical workers, a good number of whom are wives of teaching assistants. It has a good number of male members, however, in the professional and technical categories, and is attempting to bring them into more prominence. If one main campus white-collar union is eventually formed, Local 1695 appears to be the most logical base. The professors' local, the least active of the four and the only one to be created before the FSM (in 1963) gained greatly in both strength and experience during that period.

The emotional link is somewhat more tenuous, but the new unions clearly share with the student leaders



of the FSM a fundamental distrust of the "goodness" of the University—the University as a place where reasonable attitudes and policies prevail not because they are embodied in a set of regulations but because they are the natural outgrowth of a community of reasonable people. This is perhaps no more than the sort of rejection of paternalistic employers that industrial unions went through years ago, but at the University it runs into the special barbed wire thrown up by the particular set of laws and legal rulings that circumscribe working relations between public employers and their employees. The situation is made even more difficult and confusing by the University's semi-autonomous position in the State structure. The University is adept at maneuvering in this legal fog to defend the positions it wishes to defend. It has also, in the case of the craft unions, for example, made certain accommodations to keep these strong, non-nonsense unions happy. (Many, if not all, of their members on campus are paid twice a month, while most University employees like other State employees are paid only once a month, and many of them receive a monthly health and welfare payment—to allow them to buy fringe benefits through their unions—that in effect gives them benefits substantially better than those received by other University employees.)

Pay and benefits, though always sources of labor-management conflicts, are not major issues with the new unions, even though University wages are usually behind and never ahead of wages outside. The most frequent complaints are about working conditions. Employee policies are often unreasonable, often are set at departmental levels or lower, which puts a great deal of arbitrary power in the hands of individual supervisors, it is said. Avenues for changing these policies or for circumventing supervisors are either non-existent or ineffectual, it is further charged. When an employee grievance is raised, it presently goes through a grievance procedure that is not trusted by the unions, primarily because the procedure does not involve a review of the case by an independent body with binding authority on the University as well as on the grievant.

The personnel manual for the Berkeley campus outlines a three-step grievance procedure for non-academic employees. Step one calls for the employee to appeal the action in question to the head of his own department. Step two carries the appeal to the Personnel Appeals Committee, made up of two members of the faculty and one non-academic employee, all appointed by the administration, and there the issue is aired in a fairly formal way with witnesses, cross-examinations, and rights to legal or union representation. The committee reports its recommendations to the chancellor, who must make the decision.

The third step carries the appeal to the president, whose decision is final. A similar procedure is used for employees with academic positions who are not members of the Academic Senate—such as TAs and librarians. The second step in that procedure carries the matter to the appropriate dean, and the third step takes it to the Appeals Committee—two faculty members and an academic non-senate employee, appointed by the chancellor—which gives its recommendation to the chancellor, whose decision is final. The University points out that, because these men are members of the faculty, the appeals committees often include some of the nation's outstanding labor arbitrators (Sam Kagel, for instance), and that the chancellor has never failed to accept an Appeals Committee recommendation. The record also shows that in the last three years only five non-academic employee grievances have gone through the second step of a hearing before the Appeals Committee, and two of these were decided in favor of the employee. The unions respond that the reason so few grievances go before the committee is not because there are not cases but because the procedure is not trusted, and can't be until the employees have a say in who sits on the committee.

IF YOU MENTION the name of Jack La Chappelle in the Berkeley campus Personnel Office you are likely to be met with a weary sigh and a smile of familiarity, for La Chappelle has been on their minds, if not in their hearts, for some time. In 1951, he became an "on-call" x-ray technician at Cowell Hospital. The job called for him to be home by his telephone from six in the evening to eight in the morning every weekday and throughout every other weekend. He was called to the hospital for emergency work about five times every week, often in the middle of the night, and about the same number of times every weekend he was on duty. The calls ranged from between 20 minutes and several hours. At half regular wages for every on-call hour—about 90 per month—plus regular wages for the hours he was called to the hospital, the job brought in a substantial paycheck.

Two years later La Chappelle took an additional daytime job at the hospital as part of its regular x-ray staff. Ten years later he left the daytime job (to help establish a Department of Radiology at Merritt Junior College in Oakland, a department he now heads) but he kept the on-call job. A year or so later he was "fired"—placed on zero hours indefinitely, he says—from the on-call job, which he had held for 14 years, because a decision had been made at the hospital to give the on-call jobs only to regular staff members. Within a few days he began an appeals procedure that has now lasted four and a half years.

La Chappelle went up the steps. According to the ground rules laid down by the Appeals Committee, he says, his dismissal had to be based on disciplinary reasons or on the lack of work, but the committee upheld his dismissal on grounds that it best met the medical needs of the hospital. At no time, he maintains, was his ability questioned. Eventually he took the case to court, and last December the Alameda County Superior Court ruled that non-academic employees of the University do have the right to sue the University to vindicate rights allegedly denied them under their contract of employment—in this case, says his attorney, the right to hold the Appeals Committee to its own ground rules and the right to a stenographic record of the hearings. The ruling, however, amounts only to a first step in the legal battle and is not a vindication of La Chappelle's own claim against the University.

Leaders of the new campus unions like to talk about this case, not necessarily for its particular merits, but for the University's position as presented in the court hearings by its attorney, Milton Gordon. Ironically, the University's greatest strength, the autonomy that allows it to hire whoever it wants and teach whatever it wants, here, in the eyes of many of its employees, becomes its greatest weakness. For Gordon argued that while the University seeks to be fair to its employees it does not have to be, and no authority outside the University can force it to be except the Legislature.

THIS POSITION was most clearly placed on the record in a case brought against the University by Miss Chizuko Ishimatsu, a librarian at the San Francisco Medical Center for three years before she was dismissed. In a hearing in the State District Court of Appeals in 1965, Judge Joseph Karesh pursued the question of whether the University can fire someone at will for reasons of personal dislike.

"Suppose they just do not like her?" Karesh asked.

"She is not performing satisfactorily?" Gordon replied.

"No. 'I do not like her personality.' 'I do not want you around; you bother me.' Can you do it?"

"As the law presently stands?"

"Yes."

"Yes, if she has no tenure of employment; if she has no contract of employment for any given term. And this is the case here."

Judge Karesh concluded that the University "can fire you for anything if they want to just fire you. They have got that right." He also indicated that had he the right he would have put Miss Ishimatsu back to work. Her case is now on appeal.

This case, quite naturally, struck a few sympathetic

chords among librarians on the Berkeley campus. What can you do, the unionized librarians wrote in their publication, *CU Voice*, when your employer has such rights? "One thing you can do is appeal to him, ask him to provide safeguards against arbitrary personnel practices. You can hope he will understand that the minor loss he suffers in administrative sovereignty will be more than compensated for in the confidence and loyalty an employee may feel when his employer substitutes contractual assurances for majestic doubletalk. Or you can protest to your immediate superior. You can write letters, as a concerned individual, to Library and University administrators. You can find colleagues to commiserate with. You can quit. You can pray." You can also, they concluded, join the union.

The librarians' Local 1795 grew out of the professors' local, first as a chapter, and then on its own. It is now probably the strongest union of librarians in the country. President of the local is Rudolf Lednický, librarian of Slavic and East European languages, who was the first head of the group, stepped out, and now finds himself back in the job because no one else is willing or able to devote the time it takes. His main target is the administration of University Librarian Donald Coney, who retires this June. (There is a tendency now to hold off until Coney's replacement takes over in hopes that changes will follow.) Coney, the union members charge, treats them as employees rather than as colleagues and fellow professionals. They would like to see an atmosphere of friendly cooperation where their opinions would carry some weight in determining library policies. Coney, who told a meeting of library administrators some ten years ago that library staffs "are composed of two kinds: those who follow directions, and those who make decisions," believes in a rather firm chain of command. He is not unaware of the effectiveness of unions, however, and wrote in a recent issue of *LIBRARY JOURNAL* that "unions in libraries are a factor to be reckoned with now and in the future. They appear to be a more effective instrument for representing the interests of employees to management than are professional organizations." He went on to say that for library administrations "the problem is to encourage the adoption of a mechanism which will provide 'voice' for all professional staff without damaging the delegation-of-authority mechanism—the management hierarchy."

MARJORIE GREEN, a slim, attractive secretary in her mid-twenties, is the sparkplug of AFSCME Local 1695, which was born at the Institute for Human Development after about ten employees there had tossed the idea around for more than a year. With the help

## BREAD

This year's crop of college graduates, 828,000-strong appears to be one of the most sought-after groups in the nation. . . . A student in business administration, with a major in accounting, who graduates with a bachelor's degree, can take his pick of jobs in the present market; he can command a starting salary of \$9,000 and up, generally speaking.

Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1968, page 13.

## ... AND

Librarian Shortage Grows, Pushing up Wages and Spur-ring Raiding

The New York Public Library, recruiting at 38 colleges this spring, has a record 106 vacancies. Chicago needs 50 librarians, Detroit 25, Columbia University "literally has to comb the country" for librarians. The New York Federal Reserve Bank's library spends four months trying to fill one position.

A major cause of the shortage: the rapid growth of technical corporate libraries. When Cargill, Inc., a Minneapolis grain processor, needed a librarian it went to a university library and "took the best young man they had," says a company official. Library schools will produce about 5,600 graduates this June, but they're snatched up quickly. Denver University's library school has "eight job offers for every graduate."

The American Library Association figures starting librarians' pay averages \$7,300 a year, up from \$6,500 in 1965; some top jobs pay over \$20,000.

Wall Street Journal, April 23, 1968, page 1.

## ... BUTTER

### PERSONNEL ANALYST

#### Duties summary

Work as personnel representative for a group of departments involving a variety of activities. Determine classification levels of large variety of positions; interpret rules and policies; assist employees in resolving personnel problems; assist in special studies.

#### Minimum education and experience qualifications

Bachelor's degree in appropriate field and two years related experience, preferably in job audit and classification.

#### Pay

\$746 - \$905 per month (\$8,952 - \$10,860 per year); 5 steps.

Based on UCLA Current Job Openings, April 15, 1968.

### LIBRARIAN I-II

#### Duties summary

The Gifts Librarian, under the supervision of the Section Head, is in charge of the receipt, acknowledgment and processing of all gifts received in the library, is responsible for the disposal and storage of duplicates and gifts, and participates in the library's program for reaching potential donors in Southern California. The work includes bibliographical checking and supervision of student help.

#### Minimum education and experience qualifications

Bachelor's degree, Master's degree from accredited library school. Reading knowledge of one or more foreign languages. Knowledge of books and the book market and a flair for public relations.

#### Pay

\$558.33 - \$787.50 per month (\$6,700 - \$9,450 per year); 8 steps.

Based on UCLA job announcement, December 6, 1967.

## The Librarian as Scholar

I... affirm my belief, first that there is a basic stock of professional knowledge which is common to all types of libraries and information centres, in which all who work in libraries should be thoroughly versed; and second, that there are many additional skills which have to be applied in different kinds of libraries. This, however, is not the end of the story: the large research libraries need scholarship and scholarly potential in pure academic subjects if they are to deal fully and in depth with the printed and manuscript material, including prints, maps and music of all ages and all countries and in all languages, which they accumulate for the benefit of their users.

It is the young men and women of high academic achievement and competence who are responsible for the problems of the correct categorization of library work. Libraries need their scholarship, indeed they depend upon it and they should foster its development. Not unnaturally this group looks to its scholarship for its rewards and its inner intellectual satisfaction. It is in my view imperative that full scope should be given them for the exercise of their academic ability. It may be impossible for them to follow their own special research work, except in their own time, but their official work should be organized in such a way that proper outlets should be provided for their scholarly expertise. This should certainly be possible in the large research libraries.

Frank Francis, "The Scholar as Librarian," Times Literary Supplement, March 7, 1968.

## A Little Strength Works Wonders

As a result of activities during "Stop The Draft Week", October 16 - 20, 1967, 72 persons were cited by the University of California, Berkeley. Among them were four teaching assistants who were denied hearings by the Non-Senate Academic Grievance Committee. The Committee, which was established after the December 1966 student strike and consisted of a three-man board chosen by the administration from a list drawn up by AFT Local 1570, stated that the four teaching assistants were disciplined through student disciplinary channels for action committed in their capacity as students and not as employees of the University. AFT Local 1570 (teaching assistants) contended that the Committee should have jurisdiction over any case where an employee's job is threatened. In this case, suspension of the four teaching assistants would have resulted in their losing their jobs because the jobs were contingent on their status as students.

While these negotiations were taking place, Local 1570 learned that although they had reached a verbal agreement with the University in 1966 that the hearing committee would be chosen from names supplied by the union, and despite the fact that the committee then in existence had been selected from the union's list, the University had now written a procedure by which the committee was to be chosen by the Chancellor but not from the union's list.

It was this tactic by the administration that strongly influenced the granting of strike sanction to Local 1570 by the Alameda Central Labor Council on February 9, 1968. The executive committee of the Central Labor Council endorsed the sanction unanimously, as did the Council itself. Despite the granting of the strike sanction, however, Local 1570, with the help of the Central Labor Council, continued negotiations with the University. Negotiations are still going on, with two significant demands already won by the teaching assistants. A student depending on the results of the committee hearing, and the teaching assistants now have a written grievance procedure.

procedure which provides for a three-man hearing committee to be selected by the administration from a list of qualified hearing officers drawn up by the union.

During the recent strike against the American Telephone and Telegraph Company by the Communications Workers of America, members of the Pacific Telephone Company management worked on the installation of a Centrex system on campus. The CWA obtained sanction from the Alameda Central Labor Council, and set up a picket line at the main entrances to the University on Monday morning, April 22, 1968.

Unfortunately not all campus unions had been notified, and the picket line was largely ineffective. The teamsters observed the line for about an hour, the masonry and metal workers went home for the day. Members of the University Federation of Librarians stayed out for an hour, and went to work when they learned that almost no other unions were observing the picket line.

However, on Tuesday morning, April 23, representatives of the CWA met with representatives of the building trades unions and obtained their support. Further negotiations between the CWA and the University resulted in the University's ordering the Pacific Telephone Company to cease all work on the installation of the Centrex system until the strike was settled.

When enough pressure is exerted, the University gives a little — as little as possible, but it does give. It takes a great deal of courage for career employees to apply the kind of pressure needed to effect reforms. Union librarians, who have been struggling for several years now to obtain certain modest concessions from the University — a waiver of fees for academic study, an equitable grievance procedure — anticipate the time when a little strength will work wonders for them too.

## Statewide Librarians' Association

4. To propose to the University administration that this organization be recognized as the official statewide body within the University structure where librarians have the opportunity to participate in the deliberative and decision-making process of the University.

The Librarians Association has now completed its formative stage. A structure has been approved, officers elected, committees appointed, and local divisions formed on each campus. Two major conclusions can already be drawn: that UC librarians, whether union members or not, are overwhelmingly committed to the establishment of an organization which can provide them with a formal voice in University affairs; and that differences of opinion as to how this end can best be achieved cannot obscure the broad basic community of purpose that will serve to unite those librarians for the tasks that lie ahead.



## Welcome

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

ne Month

James Everett Skipper Librarian on the Berkeley California on August 1, 1968. He was hired after 22 years of service announced by Chancellor Royce L. Wilentz by the University Regent Board last November.

A native of Florida, Dr. Skipper received his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of North Carolina. He has worked in the library field at Sonoma College, Ohio State University, and the University of Connecticut. In 1959 he was the first Executive Secretary of the American Association of University Libraries. Currently he is Librarian at Princeton. He is also in the Department of Library Science, as Chairman of the Library Services Division of the American Association of University Libraries and as building consultant for the University of California.

Dr. Skipper's doctoral dissertation was "The Ohio State University Library: A Study of Numerous Articles on Various Subjects and Library Organization." He is currently on the editorial board of College and Research Libraries.

Form L9-Series 4989

Cooperation in Metropolitan New York" (in Studies in Library Administrative Problems, New York, Rutgers University Press, 1960); "The Present State and Future Development of Technical Services" (Library Resources and Technical Services, Summer, 1962); "The Role of the Federal Government in Academic Library Development" (The Southeastern Librarian, May, 1965). He edited the Library Trends issue (January, 1960) devoted to photoduplication. He is currently on the editorial board of College and Research Libraries.

Dr. Skipper is married and the father of four children.

organizations of qualified people like business organizations prevails. The head of the organization is a boss who is fair and even subordinates and criticism, the organization is indirectly discouraged. No one is appreciated. No one is meek, inarticulate, without guts. It also fosters intellectual or emotional and considers it as a job.

What Would You Do With  
in Journal of Education  
Summer 1966, page 25.

one of the University of California Business Administration of top management and today is a strong breed of professionals."

Sylvia Porter in her dedicated column, "Your Money", May 1968.

Changes at the University of California have been achieved "only after resort to confrontation and the threat of force."

President Charles J. Hitch,  
UC Centennial Commencement,  
June 15, 1968.

CU Voice  
P. O. Box 997  
Berkeley, California 94701



90810 88/1 707

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
LIBRARY  
SERIALS  
DEPARTMENT